4th February 1925]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"With reference to clause (c), I know that the section provides for the issue of such notices. Apart from the presumption I want to know whether any step has been taken to the serving of these notices to the parties before taking action."

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—"If the reports show that such notices have not been served the Government will have to consider what steps are necessary."

Local Boards and Municipal Councils.

Dindigul Municipality.

*58 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) how long the privilege of electing its chairman was enjoyed by the Dindigul municipality and why it was withdrawn ;

(b) whether the council was given an opportunity of explaining the grounds on which the privilege was withdrawn ;

(c) whether all the papers relating to the grounds on which the Government took action were placed before the municipal council ;

(d) if the Government thought that the municipal council was incompetent to discharge its duties, why the extreme step of withdrawing the privilege of electing its chairman was taken, when they would have acted under section 41 of the District Municipalities Act either by dissolving or superseding the council ;

(e) whether the Collector of the Madura district was consulted with regard to the matter and whether it was on his advice that the privilege was withdrawn ;

(f) whether the then chairman was asked to explain the conduct of the council in the light of the report of the Collector ;

(g) whether the Government will place on the table all the correspondence that took place in connexion with the withdrawal of the privilege ;

(h) whether the Government received any mahazar from the electorate of the municipality and a copy of the resolutions passed at a meeting held on 28th August 1924 at Dindigul ;

(i) whether the Government made any private inquiry or at least tried to know the wishes of the people of the municipality in connexion with the matter ;

(j) whether the Government had any object in view in enlarging the number of councillors from 17 to 24 by G.O. No 2638, dated 23rd September 1924, especially after the council was asked to state their reasons why the privilege of electing its chairman should not be withdrawn ; and

(k) the number and the names of municipal councillors who resigned after the withdrawal of the privilege ?

A.—(a) The Council was enjoying the privilege since 1885. The reasons for the withdrawal of the privilege are contained in Notification No. 1113 published in Part I-A of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 11th November 1924, and placed on the Council Table on 3rd December 1924.

(b) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*c*) & (*f*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the proviso to section 12 (1) of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920. This proviso was duly complied with.
(*d*) The point has already been explained at a meeting of the Legislative Council.
(*e*) The Collector was consulted.
(*g*) The question having been discussed in the Council at great length, the Government are not prepared to place any papers on the table of the Legislative Council.
(*h*) The Chairman forwarded to Government copies of a mahazar and of the resolutions passed at a public meeting held on 28th August 1924.
(*i*) As a notification on the subject had been issued in the Gazette, there was no need for any private inquiry.
(*j*) The answer is in the negative. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the provisions of section 7 (1) of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920.
(*k*) The Government have no information.

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—" With regard to clause (*e*), may I have the answer with regard to the second part of the question, viz., whether it was on the advice of the Collector that the privilege was withdrawn ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" The Collector was consulted. But it cannot be said that it was on the advice of the Collector that the Government acted. Government considered several questions and came to the conclusion that it was necessary and desirable that a nominated president should be appointed."

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—" May I know what the recommendation of the Collector was ? "

The hon the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Government are not prepared to disclose what the Collector recommended."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know the reason why ? Is it because that the Collector suggested that the privilege ought not to be withdrawn ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" The reason is that the correspondence between the Collector and the Government are treated as confidential."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Has the Government any idea of withdrawing their order ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Government have already given the answer that in case the administration proves satisfactory they are prepared to extend the privilege."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" What is the opinion of the Government with regard to the administration so far ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" They are not in a position to say just now whether it is satisfactory or not."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With regard to clause (*k*), may I ask whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Yes, the Government wi l call for the information."

4th February 1925]

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—" May I know, Sir, if the next turn of being deprived of the privilege of electing its chairman is that of the municipality of Cuddapah ? " (Cries of ' Order, order.')

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—" With regard to clause (*i*), may I know whether the Government took into consideration the resolutions passed at the public meeting held on the 28th August 1924 ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—" Does the hon. Minister mean that the resolutions or communications have not been forwarded to the Government ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" No."

Suit regarding the chairmanship of Dindigul municipality.

* 59 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the suit instituted in the Sub-Court at Madura by Mr. M. J. Muhammad Meera Sahib Bahadur for declaration of the chairmanship has been disposed of ;

(*b*) if not, whether the Government considered the advisability of withdrawing the privilege, when the question between the rival candidates for chairmanship was *sub judice* ;

(*c*) whether there was any civil revision petition pending in the High Court at the beginning of this year in connexion with the councillorship of Mr. Ramaswami Nayudu, one of the rival candidates for the chairmanship ;

(*d*) whether any Adi-Dravida councillor tendered his resignation in April 1924 ;

(*e*) if so, whether it was in order ;

(*f*) whether any letter of resignation was sent by the Adi-Dravida councillor to the Collector of Madura ;

(*g*) whether the nomination of Mr. Ramaswami Nayudu to the councillorship was got by telegram from the Government by the Collector ; and

(*h*) if so, the urgency for the same ?

A.—(*a*) The Government have no information.

(*b*), (*c*) & (*d*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*e*) Presumably it was.

(*f*) The Government have no information.

(*g*) & (*h*) A telegram was issued to the Collector in addition to the usual Government Order approving the appointment of Mr. Ramaswami Nayudu. The Government are not prepared to give any further information.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With reference to clauses (*g*) and (*h*) of this question, may I ask whether there is any practice of sending telegrams to Collectors with regard to appointments and if not why was it so done in this case ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Sometimes telegrams are sent."

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—" With regard to the same clauses the answer says that a telegram was sent approving the appointment of Mr. Ramaswami Nayudu. Was Mr. Ramaswami Nayudu appointed by the Collector ? "